

## THE EFFECT OF TRIFLUOPERAZINE ON BRONCHIAL RESPONSIVENESS IN ASTHMA

J. J. Bowden, K. M. Latimer, A. J. Crockett and R. E. Ruffin

*Department of Medicine, Flinders Medical Centre, Bedford Park, South Australia, Australia*

*(Received 3 August 1987; revision received 16 December 1987)*

### SUMMARY

1. The protective effects of oral trifluoperazine (TFP) (7mg) against standardized methacholine and histamine inhalation tests (MIT and HIT) were examined 2 and 22 h post-treatment in eight stable asthmatics using a randomized double-blind protocol.

2. A preliminary study tested whether a preceding MIT influenced the result of a subsequent HIT.

3. The mean baseline forced expiratory volumes in 1 s ( $FEV_1$ ) were similar prior to placebo and TFP. The mean  $FEV_1$  values 2 h after ingestion of placebo or TFP were not different from the baseline values.

4. TFP did not alter bronchial responsiveness to inhaled methacholine or histamine 2 h post-ingestion, but at 22 h the  $PC_{20}$  methacholine was greater than placebo, while  $PC_{20}$  histamine did not change. This change in methacholine responsiveness was not clinically significant.

5. There was a correlation between geometric mean provocative concentration of histamine to cause 20% fall in FEV ( $PC_{20}H$ ) for HIT performed in isolation ('separate day') and for HIT performed after MIT ('same day').

6. The effect of inhaled TFP (10 mg/ml, nebulized for 5 min) was examined single-blind and placebo-controlled in a separate group of six stable asthmatics.

7. Inhaled TFP had a bronchoconstrictor effect in all six asthmatics. The mean fall in  $FEV_1$  was 36.4% after inhaled TFP and 2.1% after saline.

8. In the asthmatics studied, ingested TFP exhibited a weak anticholinergic effect 22 h post-treatment, but a brisk spontaneously self reverting bronchoconstrictor response was invariably seen when TFP was inhaled.

**Key words:** asthma, bronchial responsiveness, bronchoconstriction, calmodulin, histamine, methacholine, trifluoperazine.

Correspondence: Dr R. E. Ruffin, Department of Medicine, Flinders Medical Centre, Bedford Park, SA 5042, Australia.

## INTRODUCTION

Contraction of airways smooth muscle is mediated by intracellular calcium-dependent messenger systems. A current model suggests that a rise in intracellular calcium ( $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ ) leads to activation of a calmodulin complex with activation of the enzyme myosin light chain kinase and myosin phosphorylation. Subsequent cyclic attachment and detachment of myosin 'crossbridges' to actin produces smooth muscle contraction (Coburn 1977; Rodger 1985).

Antagonists that block calcium shifts into or within the smooth muscle cells should reduce contraction. Studies of the effects of a variety of calcium channel antagonists in natural and induced asthma have shown clinically unimportant effects (Barnes 1985). However, currently available calcium antagonists have weak effects on shifts through calcium channels and mobilization of intracellular calcium stores in airway smooth muscle. Antagonism of intracellular mediators of the calcium messenger system may be a more potent method of blocking bronchoconstriction (Middleton 1984; Barnes 1985). Currently, no specific calmodulin blocking drugs are available for clinical or experimental use in humans.

Psychotropic drugs, like trifluoperazine (TFP), can inhibit a variety of calmodulin-dependent enzymes through selective calcium-dependent binding to the protein (Roufogalis 1981; Weiss *et al.* 1982). Trifluoperazine has anticholinergic and weak  $\alpha$ -adrenoceptor blocking properties in addition to its ability to antagonize calmodulin (Baldessarini 1985). It was postulated that TFP may have a protective effect against induced bronchoconstriction but we did not expect it to have an effect on airways function in stable asthmatics.

In the present study the effect of ingested TFP (7 mg), given double-blind and placebo-controlled, was compared with inhaled methacholine- (MIT) and histamine- (HIT) induced bronchoconstriction, 2 and 22 h post-treatment, in eight stable asthmatics. A separate study was undertaken to ensure that the sequence of MIT and HIT, on the same day, did not bias the measurement. When the ingested pretreatment produced only a small change in methacholine response and larger doses provoked marked drowsiness, a second study was designed to deliver TFP pretreatment ( $<0.25$  mg delivered to the airways), as an aerosol, using a single-blind placebo-controlled protocol.

## METHODS

*Ingested TFP study*

Eight stable asthmatics (six men), aged 18–52 years (mean 32 years), and with no additional medical illness, were recruited from the Respiratory Outpatient Clinic. All had been on the same treatment for at least 6 weeks and were not using antihistamine, phenothiazines or calcium antagonist drugs. Aerosol bronchodilators were withheld for 6 h, and ingested theophylline for 12 h before each study day, but the use of aerosol beclomethasone dipropionate was not interrupted. The subjects attended at the same time of day for each test, rested in the laboratory for 20 min and then baseline forced expired volume in 1 s ( $\text{FEV}_1$ ) was measured in triplicate using a single breath bellows spirometer (Vitalograph). All baseline  $\text{FEV}_1$  values had to be within 10% of the value found on the first day for the study to proceed.

A preliminary study was performed to validate that consecutive MIT and HIT on the same day did not introduce error. MIT and HIT were performed as single tests on separate days in random order and then as consecutive tests in the order MIT and HIT on the same day. MIT and HIT were performed by the standardized method described by Cockcroft (1985). Aerosols were generated from a Wright nebulizer with an airflow of 9 l/min producing an output of 0.15 ml/min. A control

saline inhalation was inhaled for 2 min by tidal mouth breathing and then FEV<sub>1</sub> was measured at 30 and 90 s. Subsequently, doubling concentrations of methacholine or histamine were inhaled for 2 min and FEV<sub>1</sub> measured at 30 and 90 s and then at minute intervals until bronchoconstriction eased. The tests were continued until a greater than 20% fall in FEV<sub>1</sub> was achieved from the lowest satisfactory post-saline FEV<sub>1</sub> measurement. The provocative concentration of aerosol causing a 20% fall in FEV<sub>1</sub> (PC<sub>20</sub>M for methacholine and PC<sub>20</sub>H for histamine) was obtained from the log dose-response curve by linear interpolation. In the TFP/placebo study, baseline spirometry was measured, the test drug was ingested and 2 h later FEV<sub>1</sub> was remeasured. A MIT was performed, followed 1 h later by a HIT provided that the FEV<sub>1</sub> had returned to >80% of the pre-MIT value; if required, the HIT was delayed for more than 1 h until the FEV<sub>1</sub> reached that value. Twenty-two hours after the test medication, consecutive MIT and HIT were repeated. One week later, the same protocol was completed after ingestion of the alternate pretreatment. Subjects were questioned about drowsiness 24 h after each drug treatment.

#### Inhaled TFP study

A different cohort of six stable asthmatics (four men), aged 23–51 years (mean 36 years), underwent a HIT to quantitate non-specific bronchial responsiveness (PC<sub>20</sub>H). On two separate test days, the subjects were randomly assigned aerosol inhalation of TFP or saline, given single-blind. The same medication exclusions used in the earlier study applied. Baseline FEV<sub>1</sub> was measured, then TFP (5 ml, 10 mg/ml, pH = 2.1) or acidified saline (pH = 2.1) was inhaled by tidal breathing for 5 min. Each aerosol was generated by a Wright nebulizer (output 0.15 ml/min) and FEV<sub>1</sub> was measured at 30 s, 1.5, 2.5, 3.5, 5, 7.5, 10, 15, 20, 30, 40, 50 and 60 min after completion of the inhalation.

Each study was approved by the Clinical Investigation Committee of Flinders Medical Centre and the participants gave informed written consent.

#### Statistical analysis

Student's *t*-tests examined all FEV<sub>1</sub> values at baseline and 2 and 22 h after the ingested pretreatment as well as the respective, logarithmically transformed PC<sub>20</sub> values. Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated to compare separate and same day PC<sub>20</sub>H values, and PC<sub>20</sub>M with PC<sub>20</sub>H values. The reliability of the inhalation challenges with histamine and methacholine was tested by establishing Pearson correlation coefficients for PC<sub>20</sub>M and PC<sub>20</sub>H on placebo Day 1 and 2.

Student's *t*-tests examined the maximal %  $\Delta$  FEV<sub>1</sub> after inhaled TFP and saline. A *P* value <0.05 was considered significant (Norris 1986).

## RESULTS

#### Consecutive MIT, HIT vs separate day MIT, HIT

The baseline FEV<sub>1</sub> values were not different before MIT  $3.48 \pm 0.91$  l and before HIT  $3.38 \pm 0.72$  l for separate day tests ( $P > 0.25$ , *t*-test, d.f. = 7). However, the FEV<sub>1</sub> on the same day test was lower preceding the HIT ( $3.04 \pm 0.64$  l) than the MIT ( $3.40 \pm 0.78$  l;  $P < 0.01$ , *t*-test, d.f. = 7) (Table 1). The correlation coefficient between separate and same day MIT was  $r = 0.876$  ( $P = 0.004$ ), and there was no difference between the geometric mean PC<sub>20</sub> values of 0.60 for separate day and 0.50 mg/ml for same day test ( $P > 0.2$ , *t*-test, d.f. = 7). The correlation coefficient between separate and same day HIT was  $r = 0.87$  ( $P = 0.005$ ) and there was no difference between

lular calcium-dependent messenger  
cium (Ca<sup>2+</sup>) leads to activation of a  
in light chain kinase and myosin  
ent of myosin 'crossbridges' to actin  
1985).

smooth muscle cells should reduce  
channel antagonists in natural and  
(Barnes 1985). However, currently  
is through calcium channels and  
muscle. Antagonism of intracellular  
more potent method of blocking  
ity, no specific calmodulin blocking  
ins.

t a variety of calmodulin-dependent  
protein (Roufogalis 1981; Weiss *et al.*  
renoceptor blocking properties in  
1985). It was postulated that TFP  
ation but we did not expect it to have

given double-blind and placebo-  
and histamine- (HIT) induced  
asthmatics. A separate study was  
the same day, did not bias the  
a small change in methacholine  
second study was designed to deliver  
aerosol, using a single-blind placebo-

32 years), and with no additional  
ic Clinic. All had been on the same  
amine, phenothiazines or calcium  
or 6 h, and ingested theophylline for  
clomethasone dipropionate was not  
or each test, rested in the laboratory for  
(*V*<sub>1</sub>) was measured in triplicate using a  
FEV<sub>1</sub> values had to be within 10% of

secutive MIT and HIT on the same day  
single tests on separate days in random  
T on the same day. MIT and HIT were  
croft (1985). Aerosols were generated  
an output of 0.15 ml/min. A control

Table 1. Influence of methacholine challenge on subsequent histamine challenge

Subject no.	Separate test day				Same day test			
	FEV <sub>1</sub> (l)	PC <sub>20</sub> M (mg/ml)	FEV <sub>1</sub> (l)	PC <sub>20</sub> H (mg/ml)	FEV <sub>1</sub> (l)	PC <sub>20</sub> M (mg/ml)	FEV <sub>1</sub> (l)	PC <sub>20</sub> H (mg/ml)
1	2.62	0.33	2.56	0.51	2.58	0.35	2.25	0.78
2	3.52	0.15	3.53	0.22	3.48	0.18	3.22	0.21
3	3.30	1.33	3.35	1.90	3.35	1.65	3.15	1.36
4	4.00	0.76	3.96	0.54	4.02	0.67	3.25	0.78
5	5.10	1.19	4.45	0.55	4.72	0.56	3.95	0.31
6	4.20	0.50	4.00	0.66	3.88	0.27	3.73	0.61
7	2.50	0.40	2.55	0.69	2.65	0.42	2.25	0.60
8	2.65	1.40	2.70	2.08	2.58	0.86	2.50	1.30
Mean	3.48	0.60	3.38	0.70	3.40	0.50	3.04	0.63
s.d.	0.91	0.34	0.72	0.31	0.78	0.34	0.64	0.28

the geometric mean PC<sub>20</sub> values of 0.70 mg/ml separate day and 0.63 mg/ml for same day test ( $P > 0.4$ ,  $t$ -test, d.f. = 7).

#### Ingested TFP/placebo study

Baseline FEV<sub>1</sub> values prior to placebo  $3.35 \pm 0.76$  l and TFP  $3.32 \pm 0.91$  l were similar ( $P > 0.5$ ,  $t$ -test, d.f. = 7). The mean FEV<sub>1</sub> values 2 h after ingestion of placebo ( $3.24 \pm 0.65$  l) and TFP ( $3.24 \pm 0.83$  l) were not different from the respective baseline values ( $P > 0.15$  for both,  $t$ -test, d.f. = 7). Similarly, there was no difference in mean FEV<sub>1</sub> values 22 h after ingestion of placebo ( $3.33 \pm 0.92$  l) and TFP ( $3.35 \pm 0.68$  l;  $P > 0.5$ ,  $t$ -test, d.f. = 7). Thus, TFP had no bronchodilator effect at 2 or 22 h post-ingestion.

The geometric mean PC<sub>20</sub>M was 0.62 mg/ml at 22 h after TFP ingestion and exceeded both the placebo 22 h value of 0.48 mg/ml ( $P < 0.05$ ,  $t$ -test, d.f. = 7) and the 2 h PC<sub>20</sub>M after TFP, 0.42 mg/ml ( $P < 0.02$ ,  $t$ -test, d.f. = 7) (Table 2). There was no difference between the geometric mean PC<sub>20</sub>H values at 3 (Day 1) and 23 (Day 2) h after TFP (0.59 and 0.52 mg/ml respectively), compared with placebo (0.52 and 0.56 mg/ml;  $P > 0.25$ ,  $t$ -test, d.f. = 7; Table 3).

Table 2. Effect of ingested TFP and placebo on methacholine inhalation challenge

Subject no.	Placebo				TFP			
	Day 1*		Day 2†		Day 1*		Day 2†	
	FEV <sub>1</sub> (l)	PC <sub>20</sub> M (mg/ml)	FEV <sub>1</sub> (l)	PC <sub>20</sub> M (mg/ml)	FEV <sub>1</sub> (l)	PC <sub>20</sub> M (mg/ml)	FEV <sub>1</sub> (l)	PC <sub>20</sub> M (mg/ml)
1	2.50	0.31	2.30	0.25	2.25	0.33	2.68	0.57
2	3.20	0.20	3.42	0.19	3.42	0.16	3.35	0.29
3	3.22	0.87	3.35	1.44	3.15	1.14	3.15	2.00
4	3.92	0.92	3.95	0.75	3.62	0.61	3.80	1.04
5	3.93	0.18	4.62	0.43	4.62	0.24	4.38	0.53
6	4.00	0.34	4.08	0.32	3.98	0.35	4.10	0.42
7	2.63	0.42	2.38	0.39	2.62	0.32	2.52	0.43
8	2.55	1.00	2.58	1.05	2.33	1.00	2.85	0.78
Mean	3.24	0.43	3.32	0.48	3.24	0.42	3.35	0.62
s.d.	0.65	0.29	0.91	0.30	0.83	0.29	0.68	0.26

\*2 h after and †22 h after ingestion of medication.

**Table 3. Effect of ingested TFP and placebo on histamine inhalation challenge after a preceding methacholine inhalation challenge**

Subject no.	Placebo				TFP			
	Day 1*		Day 2†		Day 1*		Day 2†	
	FEV <sub>1</sub> (l)	PC <sub>20</sub> H (mg/ml)	FEV <sub>1</sub> (l)	PC <sub>20</sub> H (mg/ml)	FEV <sub>1</sub> (l)	PC <sub>20</sub> H (mg/ml)	FEV <sub>1</sub> (l)	PC <sub>20</sub> H (mg/ml)
1	2.08	0.37	1.85	0.22	2.22	0.38	2.17	0.36
2	3.10	0.32	3.37	0.31	3.10	0.28	3.00	0.29
3	2.95	0.62	2.93	1.08	2.80	0.72	3.00	1.06
4	3.38	0.53	3.48	0.50	3.22	0.63	3.45	0.55
5	3.55	0.18	4.06	0.31	3.96	0.27	3.60	0.10
6	3.68	0.95	3.78	0.72	3.65	0.83	3.68	0.92
7	2.25	0.43	2.05	1.17	2.17	0.85	2.19	0.83
8	2.45	2.10	2.32	1.10	2.50	1.83	2.45	1.27
Mean	2.93	0.52	2.98	0.56	2.95	0.59	2.94	0.62
s.d.	0.60	0.32	0.82	0.28	0.65	0.28	0.61	0.26

ay and 0.63 mg/ml for same day test

Thus, TFP had no bronchodilator effect. TFP ingestion and exceeded both the 0.5 h ( $P=0.001$ ) and the 2 h  $PC_{20}M$  after TFP, but no difference between the geometric means (0.59 and 0.52 mg/ml respectively),  $t$ -test, d.f. = 7; Table 3).

### ③ ACholine inhalation challenge

**Table 4. Airways effect of inhaled TFP and saline on subjects with a range of histamine responsiveness**

Subject no.	PC <sub>20</sub> H (mg/ml)	Saline		TFP	
		Baseline FEV <sub>1</sub> (l)	Max % FEV <sub>1</sub> fall	Baseline FEV <sub>1</sub> (l)	Max % FEV <sub>1</sub> fall
1	6.0	3.36	3.3	3.28	23.8
2	0.22	2.1	8.5	2.22	67.6
3	1.6	2.32	1	2.34	26.1
4	7.8	3.97	0	3.90	29.8
5	2.4	2.45	0	2.45	43.6
6	5.6	3.3	0	3.25	27.3

**This study has shown that: a preceding MIT does not significantly affect the result of a subsequent HIT provided that the FEV<sub>1</sub> has recovered to within 80% of the pre-MIT value; oral TFP (7 mg) can protect slightly against a cholinergic stimulus, but in this group of patients has no significant effect on histamine-induced bronchoconstriction; inhaled TFP is a potent bronchoconstrictor**

through mechanisms as yet unknown; bronchial responsiveness measured as PC<sub>20</sub>H and PC<sub>20</sub>M produces similar values (Juniper *et al.* 1978); and both inhalation challenges are reproducible tests (Cockcroft 1985).

Results from previous studies of repeated provocation tests have been conflicting. Ruffin *et al.* (1981) showed that four histamine tests could be repeated with 40 min intervals without tachyphylaxis in 12 moderately severe asthmatics. In contrast, Manning *et al.* (1987) showed that tachyphylaxis can occur with three repeated histamine inhalation tests in a group of mild asthmatics. However, Manning and O'Byrne (1987) have shown that acetylcholine inhalation does not cause tachyphylaxis to subsequent acetylcholine inhalation nor affect subsequent histamine inhalation in mild asthmatics. The present study confirms that a preceding cholinergic inhalation challenge does not affect a subsequent histamine challenge.

No published data are available regarding TFP and airways responsiveness, although tricyclic antidepressants (which share structural similarities with TFP) have been thought to ameliorate asthma (Meares *et al.* 1971). Further, *in vitro* studies have not specifically examined the effect of TFP on airways smooth muscle. Hence, it is difficult to predict the optimal dose of TFP required. The dose of 7 mg used in this study was chosen for two reasons. First, when prescribed as a major tranquilizer, the initial dose in adults is 5 mg, and second, a single dose of 10 mg was associated with excessive drowsiness in one investigator. Facilities for the measurement of blood levels of the drug were not available.

However, the observation of an effect of oral TFP on methacholine challenge but not on histamine challenge, suggests that the dose used was sufficient to achieve a local anticholinergic effect on airways smooth muscle. While this anticholinergic effect is statistically significant, it is small and not clinically important, but it is consistent with the previously observed weak cholinergic blocking effects of antipsychotic agents (Baldessarini 1985). The failure to observe protection against histamine-induced bronchoconstriction in this study may be due to the oral TFP dose being insufficient to block calmodulin or to calmodulin inhibition not being a potent protective mechanism for bronchial smooth muscle contraction. The former possibility was investigated by using the aerosol formulation. Surprisingly, each subject bronchoconstricted with this treatment. The mechanism for this was not pH-dependent (saline control had an equivalent pH of 2.1) and is unlikely to be due to a hyperosmolar challenge as 10 mg/ml TFP in saline solution has an osmolality of 304 mmol/kg.

An *in vitro* study by Paechell and Pearce (1985) has shown that compounds with calmodulin antagonist properties (including TFP) have a dual effect on histamine release by rat peritoneal mast cells. At high concentrations these compounds released histamine by cell autolysis, while at low concentrations they blocked secretion of histamine to immunological and pharmacological challenges. Hence mast cell release of histamine may explain the bronchoconstrictor effect of inhaled TFP. This could then mask any protective calmodulin inhibition. The other alternative is that the lack of protection of oral TFP may indicate that non-calmodulin-mediated pathways are involved in smooth muscle contraction. Rasmussen (1986) suggested that a calmodulin-mediated process is involved in the short phase or initial smooth muscle contraction, while a C kinase protein system mediates sustained contraction. Hence, antagonism of calmodulin alone may be insufficient to block smooth muscle contraction. Other pharmacological properties of TFP, such as  $\alpha$ -adrenoreceptor antagonism, cannot be invoked as bronchodilatation was not observed in the present study.

This study does not preclude a role for calmodulin antagonists but does suggest that: the weak anticholinergic effect of low dose ingested TFP is clinically unimportant and systemic side effects prohibit the use of larger doses; inhaled TFP (<0.25 mg) causes bronchoconstriction, but further

ss measured as PC<sub>20</sub>H and PC<sub>20</sub>M on challenges are reproducible tests

s have been conflicting. Ruffin *et al.* and with 40 min intervals without, Manning *et al.* (1987) showed that halation tests in a group of mild n that acetylcholine inhalation does on nor affect subsequent histamine at a preceding cholinergic inhalation

s responsiveness, although tricyclic P) have been thought to ameliorate t specifically examined the effect of t the optimal dose of TFP required. is. First, when prescribed as a major single dose of 10 mg was associated e measurement of blood levels of the

methacholine challenge but not on n to achieve a local anticholinergic effect is statistically significant, it is v in the previously observed weak sardini 1985). The failure to observe n this study may be due to the oral olin inhibition not being a potent ation. The former possibility was h subject bronchoconstricted with t (saline control had an equivalent g as 10 mg/ml TFP in saline solution

that compounds with calmodulin samine release by rat peritoneal mast amine by cell autolysis, while at low immunological and pharmacological l on the bronchoconstrictor effect of n inhibition. The other alternative is n-calmodulin-mediated pathways are suggested that a calmodulin-mediated nscle contraction, while a C kinase agonism of calmodulin alone may be nacological properties of TFP, such as odilatation was not observed in the

onists but does suggest that: the weak unimportant and systemic side effects uses bronchoconstriction, but further

studies are required to assess the possible protective effect of lower doses; and calmodulin antagonists may need to be tested in combination with agents capable of blocking membrane or intracellular calcium-dependent pathways, for clinically useful effects in the asthmatic airways.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge a grant from Fisons Pty Ltd which was used to support this study. Smith Kline & French donated trifluoperazine HCl substance and analysed the trifluoperazine solution.

#### REFERENCES

- Baldessarini, R.J. (1985) Drugs and the treatment of psychiatric disorders. In: *The Pharmacologic Basis of Therapeutics* (Ed. A.S. Gilman, L.B. Goodman, T.W. Rall & F. Murad), Chap. 19, pp. 404-417. Macmillan, New York.
- Barnes, P.J. (1985) Clinical studies with calcium antagonists in asthma. *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology*, **20**, S289-298.
- Coburn, R.F. (1977) The airway smooth muscle cell. *Federation Proceedings*, **36**, 2692-2697.
- Cockcroft, D.W. (1985) Measurement of airway responsiveness to inhaled histamine or methacholine: method of continuous aerosol generation and tidal breathing inhalation. In: *Airway Responsiveness: measurement and interpretation*, (Ed. F.E. Hargreave & A.J. Woolcock), pp. 22-28. Astra Pharmaceuticals Canada, Ontario.
- Juniper, E.F., Frith, P.A., Dunnett, C., Cockcroft, D.W. & Hargreave, F.E. (1978) Reproducibility and comparison of responses to inhaled histamine and methacholine. *Thorax*, **33**, 705-710.
- Manning, P.J., Jackson, P. & O'Byrne, P.M. (1987) Cimetidine prevents histamine tachyphylaxis in asthmatic subjects. *Thorax*, **42**, 748.
- Manning, P.J. & O'Byrne, P.M. (1987) Histamine stimulation causes tachyphylaxis to both inhaled histamine and acetylcholine in asthmatic subjects. *Thorax*, **42**, 712 (abs).
- Meares, R.A., Mills, J.E. & Horvath, T.B. (1971) Amitriptyline and asthma. *Medical Journal of Australia*, **2**, 25-28.
- Middleton, E. (1984) Airway smooth muscle, asthma and calcium ions. *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology*, **73**, 643-650.
- Norusis, M.J. (1986) *SPSS/PC+, For the IBM PC/XT/AT*. SPSS, Chicago.
- Peachell, P.T. & Pearce, F.L. (1985) Effect of calmodulin inhibitors on histamine secretion from mast cells. *Agents and Actions*, **16**, 43-44.
- Rasmussen, H. (1986) The calcium messenger system (Parts 1 and 2). *New England Journal of Medicine*, **314**, 1164-1170, 1094-1100.
- Rodger, I.W. (1985) Excitation-contraction coupling and uncoupling in airway smooth muscle. *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology*, **20**, S255-266.
- Roufogalis, B.D. (1981) Phenothiazine antagonism of calmodulin: a structurally nonspecific interaction. *Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications*, **98**, 607-613.
- Ruffin, R.E., Alpers, J.H., Crockett, A.J. & Hamilton, R. (1981) Repeated histamine inhalation tests in asthmatic patients. *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology*, **67**, 285-289.
- Weiss, B., Prozialeck, W.C. & Wallace, T.L. (1982) Interaction of drugs with calmodulin. Biochemical, Pharmacological and clinical implications. *Biochemical Pharmacology*, **31**, 2217-2226.

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**